DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 120 479 CE 006 780

AUTHOR McNett, Ian
TITLE Educational Policy-Making in Washington: Report of the First Washington Policy Seminar of the Career Education Policy Project (Washington, D.C., January 13-16, 1976).
INSTITUTION George Washington Univ., Washington, D.C. Inst. for Educational Leadership.
PUB DATE Jan 76
NOTE 39p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS *Career Education; *Conference Reports; Educational Finance; Educational Legislation; Educational Needs; Educational Planning; *Educational Policy; Educational Strategies; Government (Administrative Body); *Government Role; Legislators; *Policy Formation; Seminars
IDENTIFIERS IEL; Institute for Educational Leadership

ABSTRACT

The report summarizes the activities of a seminar designed and conducted by the Career Education Policy Project (CEPP) of the Institute for Educational Leadership (IEL) and attended by 27 career educators. The seminar provided an insight into lobbying for education, with bureaucrats, congressional members and staff aides, lobbyists, education association repreentatives, journalists, and independent observers of the Washington policy scene speaking to the participants. An outlined summary represents highlights of the seminar, including Federal role, the current scene, future trends, the policy scene, working the systems, and the career education picture. Seven chapters discuss conference proceedings and include: (1) Introduction: "Worth More Than Any College Course," describing seminar topics and participants; (2) A Limited Role, discussing Federal role in educational policy; (3) Some Current Realities, examining economic and fiscal procedures; (4) The Ripple of the Future, discussing coming changes; (5) The Policy Maze, examining the executive branch, Congress, education associations, and the courts; (6) Working the System, offering hints for influencing educational policy; and (7) Evaluation: "How I Feel A Part of American Government," examining participant evaluation of the seminar. A career education policy project profile by IEL, a schedule of seminar events, and a listing of participants are appended. (LH)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

APR 05 1976

ED120479

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

EDUCATIONAL POLICY-MAKING IN WASHINGTON

Report of the First Washington Policy Seminar

of the

Career Education Policy Project

Washington, D.C.
January 13-16, 1976

CE006780

S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

ADVISORY BOARD

CHAIRPERSON – DR. BERNICE SANDLER
Director, Project on the Status and Education of Women
Association of American Colleges, Washington, D.C.

K.Z. CHAVIS
Program Director
Leadership Development Program, Atlanta

DR. JOHN DAVIS
President, Macalester College
Saint Paul, Minnesota

DR. JOHN DUNWORTH
President
George Peabody College, Nashville

DR. LLOYD ELLIOTT
President
The George Washington University

DR. MICHAEL FAY
Director
United Teachers' Los Angeles Urban Project

FRANCIS KEPPEL
Director
Aspen Institute Education Program

HONORABLE HOWARD KLEBANOFF
Chairman, House Education Committee
Hartford, Connecticut

RUTH MANCUSO
Chairperson
New Jersey State Board of Education

RUBY G. MARTIN
General Counsel, Committee on the District of Columbia
U.S. House of Representatives

DR. LOUIS H. MAYO
Vice President for Policy Studies and Special Projects
The George Washington University

HARRY McPHERSON, JR.
Attorney, Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE JOHN PITTENGER
Secretary of Education
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania

LOIS RICE
Vice President
College Entrance Examination Board

HONORABLE MARY RIEKE
Oregon State Representative

DR. ALAN ROSENTHAL
Director
Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers University

DR. PAUL B. SALMON
Executive Director
American Association of School Administrators

DR. RICHARD C. SNYDER
Mershon Professor of Education and Public Policy
Ohio State University

DR. CHARLES WATTS
President
Bucknell University, Lewisburg, Pennsylvania

DR. PAUL N. YLVISAKER
Dean, Harvard Graduate School of Education

INSTITUTE STAFF

SAMUEL HALPERIN – Director
DIETRA ROGERS – Chief Administrative Officer
JUNE FRANK – Budget Officer

EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR
GEORGE LANE – Director
SHARON ENRIGHT – Associate Director

THE ASSOCIATES PROGRAM
JAMES BROWNE – Coordinator

EDUCATION POLICY FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM
PAUL SCHINDLER – Director

"OPTIONS IN EDUCATION" OVER NATIONAL PUBLIC RADIO
JOHN MERROW – Executive Producer

POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION CONVENING AUTHORITY
KENNETH C. FISCHER – Director

NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON WOMEN IN EDUCATION
ALICE G. SARGENT – Coordinator

CAREER EDUCATION POLICY PROJECT
GEORGE KAPLAN – Coordinator

INSTITUTE FOR
EDUCATIONAL
LEADERSHIP

THE
GEORGE
WASHINGTON
UNIVERSITY

Suite 310
1001 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Samuel Halperin
Director
(202) 833-1737

Education Policy
Fellowship Program
(202) 223-3415

Educational Staff Seminar
(202) 293-3166

The Associates Program
(202) 785-4991

Leadership Training Institute
(202) 833-9051

Postsecondary Education
Convening Authority
(202) 833-2745

"Options on Education"
over National
Public Radio
(202) 833-9178

EDUCATIONAL POLICY-MAKING IN WASHINGTON

Report of the First Washington Policy Seminar of the Career Education Policy Project

The Institute for Educational Leadership is indebted to Ian McNett, who attended all sessions of the Washington Policy Seminar and prepared this report.

Washington, D.C.
January 13-16, 1976

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUMMARY	----------	A Primer on Washington Educational Policy	p. ii
I.	----------	Introduction: "Worth More Than Any College Course"	p. 1
II.	----------	A Limited Role	p. 3
III.	----------	Some Current Realities	p. 5
IV.	----------	The Ripple of the Future	p. 9
V.	----------	The Policy Maze	p. 13
VI.	----------	Working the System	p. 17
VII.	----------	Evaluation: "Now I Feel A Part of American Government"	p. 20

APPENDICES

A.	----------	Career Education Policy Project Profile
B.	----------	Seminar Schedule
C.	----------	List of Participants

SUMMARY: A PRIMER ON WASHINGTON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Some highlights of the three and one-half day Washington Policy Seminar of the Career Education Policy Project of the Institute for Educational Leadership, held in Washington on January 13 to 16, 1976:

The Federal Role

There is no one Federal role, but many roles exemplified in categorical programs. These include:

- .Provision of educational services and program for disadvantaged students
- .Staff development of teachers at the elementary and secondary level and all staff areas at the postsecondary level
- .Support of educational research to improve elementary and secondary education and research in all policy areas at the universities
- .Stimulus of educational reform through research and incentives to schools and colleges
- .Residual programs such as impact aid and vocational education that started as reforms and lived as categorical programs

The Current Scene

- .No major new programs in support of education
- .Consolidation, refinement, and fine tuning of existing programs
- .A growing emphasis on decentralization of educational decision-making to the States in the form of block grants and revenue-sharing
- .Overall spending ceilings forcing education to compete more intensely for Federal money just to maintain the current level of support
- .Federal demand for evidence that education dollars make a difference
- .Continued bureaucratization of the Executive Branch and the beginnings of bureaucracy in Congress

Future Trends

.Uncertain picture after 1976 elections

.Greater Congressional emphasis on fiscal responsibility

.Disillusionment of teachers who are organizing to get more money for education when there is no more money to be had

.Declining enrollments taking the pressure off all levels of government

.Lower economic payoff from college degree shifting motivations for attending college

.More limited public expectations of education's ability to accelerate social change

.Greater Federal interest in income maintenance and transfer programs

.A sorting out of government roles in education with a marked drift toward an enhanced role for the States

.Emphasis in Federal policy on demand rather than supply side with the focus away from training people for jobs and providing an adequate quantity and quality of jobs

The Policy Scene

.Central role for the Office of Management and Budget in helping establish spending ceilings and clearing legislative proposals

.Decentralized policy-making in Congress, the Executive Branch, interest groups, and the courts

.Shift in source of policy ideas in bureaucracy from the program offices to the cabinet levels and the White House

.Policy structure one of bewildering complexity

.Complexity consuming much time for formulating policies and programs

Working the System

.Information is important. Policy-makers need to know the impact of the decisions they have made and evidence to support decisions they want to make.

.Different systems need different kinds of information. Congress always welcomes anecdotes and human interest stories that give character to hard facts; the bureaucracy wants defensible quantitative data.

.Know your Congressman and his staff people. Also identify key members of Congress in educational policy and get to know their staff people.

.The best place to influence a Member of Congress is at home. Schedule events for Members of Congress to attend.

.Make friends before you need them.

.Build alliances. The larger the group speaking with one voice the more attention will be paid to the group's ideas.

.Take small steps towards the ideal solution without losing sight of it. In Washington, change is incremental rather than revolutionary.

Career Education Picture

.Career education is not universally loved in Washington. It must establish itself as a permanent part of the educational landscape.

.No-one in Washington speaks exclusively in the interest of career education. But it does have friends in associations and Congress with whom career educators can work.

.There will be no vast new sums of Federal money for career education. It will have to fight for what it gets.

I. INTRODUCTION: "WORTH MORE THAN ANY COLLEGE COURSE"

The operations and policy processes of the Federal Government and the Congress are similar in kind to but vastly different in scale from those of State and local governments. Washington seems remote from the day-to-day concerns of people who operate educational programs. With its multiplicity of layers and players, the Federal Government dwarfs all others in the American system in terms of size, complexity, and the amount of money spent. But much too little is known about it by the nation's educational leaders whose professional causes and destinies are coming increasingly to be affected by it. To familiarize career educators with the complexities of the Washington scene, how it works, and who makes it work, the Career Education Policy Project (CEPP) of the Institute for Educational Leadership (IEL) designed and conducted an intensive three and one-half day Washington Policy Seminar for twenty-seven career educators from January 13 to 16, 1976. In 13 information-jammed sessions, the participants heard from bureaucrats, Members of Congress, Congressional staff aides, lobbyists, education association representatives, journalists and independent observers of the Washington policy scene.

After exposure to twenty-six speakers and panelists, Anita Barber, Career Education Coordinator, Alabama Department of Education, declared, "This was worth much more than any college course. It was the best experience I have ever had in learning about government and law."

The seminarists, a talented and attentive group of leaders in their growing movement, were exposed to a variety of points of view, differing political perspectives, the bureaucracy, the Congress, lobbying, personalities, and current and future trends in the Federal role in education. Some of them learned new phrases, concepts and organizations--uncontrollable and controllable expenditures, rescissions and deferrals, OMB, the Congressional Budget Office, and so forth.

In turn, the career educators from local school districts, State education agencies, and higher education institutions provided a fresh perspective for the speakers and panelists, who have important roles in shaping educational policy at the Federal level. Understanding and information flowed both ways.

The Seminar was designed to provide the career educators with "an educational policy map of Washington." And in those three-plus days, the policy cartographers outlined the highways, biways, roadblocks, and detours in Washington policy-making for education. There were a number of major and minor themes.

First, the participants quickly came to understand that the Federal role in education, while larger than a generation ago, remains relatively limited in size but is perhaps exceptionally large in influence and leadership. The government tends to try to provide programs in areas of national concern that have not been dealt with at the State and local levels. The result is a number of policies and roles for Washington, not just one. And the map has changed in the past ten years. Instead of bold new programs to reform education and change the social system, the interest is now in consolidation, refinement, and fine tuning of existing programs. The execution of educational policy, whether launching sweeping new ventures or tinkering with existing ones, takes place in an environment of bewildering complexity and less than deliberate speed. Policy is made and influenced everywhere, but some Washington actors have more influence than others.

The Seminar provided an insight into lobbying for education, especially in the arena of legislation. There were many practical hints on how to have an impact on policy decisions--whom to see, when to see them, and what to say once you have a policy-maker's attention. Indeed, it was at times an inadvertent "live" experience, for many of the speakers and panelists were themselves the very decision-makers the career educators needed most to understand, and the opportunity was not wasted. At the end, the participants were asked to evaluate the Seminar. The innate modesty of the Institute inhibits describing how the participants rated it. Suffice to say that IEL is proud of its effort. What follows is a fuller discussion of the highlights and major themes that emerged during the seminar.

II. A LIMITED ROLE

There is no one Federal role in education and no single Federal education policy. Instead, there are a number of policies which Washington has adopted to address national concerns that policy-makers perceived were not being met at State and local levels.

Michael Timpane, a senior researcher in the Rand Corporation's Washington office, outlined the major Federal roles in education in a policy overview that opened the seminar. Washington policy-makers have consciously deferred to an "ethic of local control and State constitutional responsibility for education," asserted Timpane, a former Deputy Assistant Secretary for Educational Planning in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW).

He was echoed by Phillip Austin, Deputy Assistant HEW Secretary for Policy Development, who said, "I am comfortable with the notion that the Federal role is a limited role, based on history, the revenue generation ability of jurisdictions and the fact that the jurisdictions closest to the people are the most responsible."

Due to self-imposed limitations, Federal educational policy-makers are "committed to work with indirect tools," Timpane explained. Patsy Fleming, research assistant for the House Rules Committee, said, "Washington sends messages to the school districts with programs. Educational policy is expressed through current programs."

Timpane listed five areas in which the Federal government has chosen to play a role in educational policy.

1. Federal policy has a "general equal opportunity thrust," Timpane said. It tries to promote education by targeting its resources on various disadvantaged populations. The "messages" are carried in, among others, such programs as Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, bilingual education programs, Indian education, programs for the handicapped, and student aid programs and special services for disadvantaged students at the postsecondary level.

2. The Federal government has a commitment to support research at two levels, according to Timpane. First is educational research focused primarily on elementary and secondary education. Second, the government supports research at higher education institutions in "every area of public policy." The areas include defense, health, mental health, transportation, space, and all the areas supported by programs of the National Science Foundation.

3. Professional training is a third area where the Federal government plays a role in education. It includes the training of teachers and other educational professionals through the Education Professions Development Act (scheduled to expire on June 30, 1976) and the Teacher Corps. All kinds of professional training are supported at the higher education level. Teachers and researchers are trained with funds provided by the various research programs.

4. The Federal role in educational reform is allied with the research idea, Timpane said. Federal reform efforts are aimed at priorities which seem at the Federal level to need support. The government does two things in this arena. "It throws money at the problem in the form of subsidies and incentives", and it tries to stimulate leadership. "The Federal government supplies modest monies which have a substantial leadership effect", Timpane said.

5. The last area in which the Federal government plays a role in education was called "residual" by Timpane. These include programs like vocational education and impact aid, which were once regarded as reforms. "Old reforms never die, they become categorical programs," Timpane noted.

Timpane noted policy areas that were not in his list. One was general aid to education, which has never attracted sufficient support to become a Federal policy, although efforts were made as long ago as the 1950's. Another policy area absent from the list is oversight responsibility which is the result of "a very clear decision," Timpane stressed. "It never came close to being enacted."

Overall, then, the Federal government has limited, specific, and targeted goals for its educational policies. It focuses on limited targets, with the weight of policy tilted towards equity and equality of educational opportunity.

III. SOME CURRENT REALITIES

The current position of education in the Federal policy structure is exemplified in the career of Representative Timothy E. Wirth (D.-Colorado), a former Deputy Assistant Secretary of HEW for Educational Planning who achieved an upset victory in 1974 with strong support from organized teachers. Wirth told the career educators that ten years ago he would have sought a seat on the House Education and Labor Committee, because that was where the action was and where his commitment and knowledge were. Instead, Wirth chose committee assignments that would give him a voice in national energy policy on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and Science and Technology.

Wirth emphasized that efforts to hold down the price of energy would have a larger impact on school budgets than any efforts he and others could make on behalf of direct support for education.

The Seminar participants were introduced to the mysteries of uncontrollable and controllable programs by Wirth and Harley M. Dirks, professional staff member of the Senate Appropriations Committee. They explained that uncontrollable spending went to programs under which the legislation obligated the government to provide money for all qualified applicants. These include social security, unemployment compensation, veterans benefits, and welfare payments. Education, health, and national defense are examples of controllable programs. Legislation in these areas establishes a spending ceiling, but the Executive Branch and Congress can and usually do choose to spend less than the maximum authorization.

With a ceiling on total spending, the rise of uncontrollable spending leaves less of the Federal funding pie to be divided among the controllable programs such as education and health. This generates fierce competition among various special interests for a very limited slice. Wirth and several other speakers stressed the need for educators to work harder just to hold the current bottom line support for education.

His comments led one career educator to state plaintively, "We'd be better off if education were an uncontrollable."

Wirth stressed the need for reform of uncontrollable programs to free money for education. Much of his attention and energy, he said, is focused on controlling the uncontrollables through reform. Unemployment benefits have zoomed to a point where they consumed forty billion dollars in a two-year period, more than was spent in the entire previous history of the program. Social security benefits also continue to rocket because of increases in the amount of benefits and the number of applicants.

The Nixon and Ford Administrations have made the control of Federal spending a number one priority, and many battles over education appropriations have been waged around this issue. Now, "Congress is getting into the ceiling business," declared Dirks, who has major staff responsibility for health, education, and welfare appropriations.

Congressional entry into the spending ceiling business is wrapped in uncertainty, said Richard Smith, a former Associate Counsel of the Senate Education Subcommittee. The new responsibility was self-imposed in legislation that established a Congressional Budget Office and Budget Committees in both the Senate and the House of Representatives. At the very least, education will have to fight harder for its share of Federal dollars under limitations established by the Budget Committees. Whether these will be higher or lower than the ceilings demanded by the Administration cannot be predicted.

In line with the general Washington posture that if anything can be made more complicated and protracted it will be, the legislation establishing the Congressional budget process also gave the Administration authority to request "deferrals and rescissions." This process was explained by Michael Resnick, Director of Legislative Services, National School Boards Association, and Chairman of the Committee for Full Funding of Education Programs. Resnick viewed rescissions and deferrals as a way to delay and perhaps kill appropriations that have been made by Congress.

He said a rescission is a request for Congress to "unappropriate" money. "While a rescission request is outstanding, it cuts the cash flow for forty-five days, at which point it dies, unless Congress approves," Resnick explained. A deferral request will cut off the cash flow for a fiscal year quarter unless Congress objects. Since a deferral can follow a rescission request, the Administration can delay the spending of money until near the end of a fiscal year when it can be argued that the money will not be wisely spent anyway, according to Resnick.

Combined with the current economic and fiscal realities is the effort of the Administration to consolidate categorical programs into general purpose block grants for the States. The emphasis is on decentralization of decision-making back to the State and local level, said Albert Alford, Assistant USOE Commissioner for Legislation. Along with the consolidation thrust of the Administration, Congress in the still-to-be-passed Education Amendments of 1976 is interested in refining and fine-tuning existing legislation, said William Cable, Counsel for the House Education and Labor Committee. "Congress will be trying to use what it has in a better and more efficient way," Cable explained.

Some speakers felt that the change towards a block grant approach and other signals meant the end of a special Federal focus on the poor and disadvantaged. They feared that general purpose block grants would tend to flow toward the more affluent schools and students, leaving the poor and disadvantaged without the special funds they started receiving with the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Dirks said consolidation would mean fewer Federal dollars and less identity for education.

The economic situation of the country may further attenuate the amount of support for poor students, said Fleming, the House Rules Committee aide. She said the higher education proposals before the House Education and Labor Committee seek to open the compensatory aid funds to middle class families which have been hit hard by the recession and inflation. "Since the Federal education budget is not keeping up with inflation, if programs for the poor are opened to the middle class, some students will lose out," Fleming asserted.

With a shrinking Federal dollar for education, inflation, and budget constraints has come the quest for accountability. Executive Branch officials and Members of Congress want to know what they are getting for the money they spend. Dirks said in regard to educational research, "We want to get a bigger bang for our bucks."

Judith Miller, Washington correspondent for The Progressive magazine, also stressed the need for education and educational researchers to be more accountable for the Federal money they spend. She urged that education learn to establish priorities--"things we can't do without"--as has been done by the hard science and biomedical research community. Congress would prefer that educators tell them what is indispensible and what is not, Miller emphasized.

"The education lobby has never been able to police itself," she said. "They say, 'We can't cut; we're stretched to the limit.' That leaves it up to Congress to cut education funds. They don't like it, but they will do it."

Miller underscored her point with specific examples of Congressional willingness to cut education and research funds. During the last fiscal year, she said, Congress cut two million dollars from the proposed budget of the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE), ten million dollars in National Institute of Education (NIE) funds, and gave the National Science Foundation its smallest increase in recent years.

Often, Miller said, Congress will seek out and find seemingly frivolous projects as a justification for cutting education budgets. In the case of FIPSE, she said, Senator Joseph Biden, a former school teacher, was outraged to find the agency supporting an indoor

cable television project that offered courses in tennis, indoor gardening, and "parenting".

Both Miller and Dirks stressed the difficulty of selling educational research to Congress and the voters. "The pressure is not great to provide additional funds," Dirks noted. He conceded that the committee had been tough on NIE. "We're hoping NIE will be able to say what it did with the seventy million dollars, what difference it made or will make if we give it money for next year."

IV. THE RIPPLE OF THE FUTURE

The crystal balls into which Washington policy prognosticators gaze these days are cloudier than usual. Nobody at the Seminar was willing to predict what might happen after the November elections or what the ultimate effect of the new Congressional budget process would be. Smith foresaw a period of turbulence and chaos in the policy scene. In spite of the uncertainties, there seemed to be some current and emerging trends that could be expected to continue or accelerate over the next few years. And there was one startling prediction.

Smith predicted that the Federal government would provide public education with one-third of its operating support in the 1980's compared to the current level of about six percent. Bruce Perlstein, an Education Policy Fellow based in Massachusetts, challenged Smith for evidence for a prediction that seemed to run against all current trends. "It's more instinctive on my part," Smith conceded. But he said he believed that local school systems would begin to collapse under their financial burdens and that the Federal government would be forced to pick up the pieces.

Most speakers expected, however, that the current modest level of support for education would continue without much drastic change for the next several years. Samuel Halperin, IEL's Director, and former Deputy Assistant Secretary of HEW for Legislation, told the participants that almost nobody in Congress was against education anymore, although education didn't have many really intense supporters either. This assertion was backed up by two members of the Committee for Full Funding of Education Programs--Resnick and Jerold Roschwalb, Director of Governmental Relations for Higher Education of the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges. They and other speakers repeatedly stressed that educators would have to work harder to maintain the current level of support.

Timpane offered some emerging trends and changes of direction from his perspective as the opening "big picture" speaker for the Seminar. He called these trends "coming issues." Some were issues that established a context for policy and others were alterations of the policy course.

First, Timpane asserted, demography as reflected in declining enrollments would remove the pressure on all levels of government, and the Federal government in particular, to provide greater resources for education. It would offer the opportunity for a catching up and leveling out in phase in terms of teacher salaries and parents' demands for quantitative and qualitative changes in education, Timpane said.

A second contextual trend was that the economic payoff from post-secondary education would not be as great as during the 1960's. Timpane said that there were estimates that the payoff from a college education was about eleven to thirteen percent a year over that of a high school diploma in the 1960's. "It's going to be a much closer call in the next couple of years," Timpane said. "People will go to college for other reasons--to get credentials, to move up a notch on the career ladder, or just to get an education."

Public opinion will expect less of education in terms of social policy. "Expectations will be limited and people won't believe exalted claims," Timpane said. Another emerging issue is the coming organization of the education professions by organized labor, he said.

"Relative to other Federal social policies, education will be in the middle of the scale," Timpane asserted. "There will be a lot more emphasis on income transfer and maintenance programs." Areas of priority will include welfare, social security, and employment policy. The government, he said, will deliver resources in dollars for individual and family needs. In terms of labor market policy, the government will place more emphasis on the demand than the supply side. Instead of training teachers and students, the government will seek to provide an adequate quantity and quality of jobs.

Overall, Timpane saw no major realignment of Federal education policies, but predicted that programs "may become more adequately funded." Bernard Martin, Chief, Economics-Science-General Government Branch, Office of Management and Budget, agreed, noting, "There will be a series of continuing disputes between Congress and the Executive Branch over the appropriate Federal role and resources. Education as a subject of policy will not be as high on the domestic agenda as environment, health, and social welfare policy."

In terms of coming changes, Timpane said the Federal role in special education and the education of the handicapped would continue to develop.

Second, he said, "The Federal government will have to reinvent staff development." But the staff development will have a different focus than in the past when there was a shortage of teachers. Declining enrollments mean that schools will have less staff turnover and fewer opportunities for promotion. "There is a desperate need for new staff development programs that have not been invented yet," Timpane asserted.

The government will continue to support student aid, graduate education, and research at the postsecondary level. And finally, Timpane predicted the passage of a Federal collective bargaining law to cover public employees, including teachers.

Donald A. Casella, Director, Office of Career Development, University of Alabama, wondered if, in view of the increased interest in programs focused on helping individuals, there would be a "comparable thrust in education."

Timpane responded: "At the higher education level, we're not that far away from a voucher system." The student aid package is close to allowing students to carry their dollars to the institution that will sell them the kind of education they want, Timpane said. He offered the possibility that the student aid approach could become more flexible in terms of when the student would spend the aid money and how long it would be available.

Wirth, the freshman Congressman, had a prediction of his own. He saw a strong effort on the part of teacher orgnizations to organize teachers to influence educational policy and to work for more money in education. He said he was afraid that when the teachers became organized they would find that the money was not available. "There will be a collapse," Wirth said. "The movement will be set back seven or eight years because expectations will be raised but the money won't be there." The teachers' movement probably would not recover until the early or middle 1980's, he stated.

Another shift at the Federal level is the way policy is made in the bureaucracy. During the 1960's, ideas for new programs often floated up from the program officers in the U.S. Office of Education (USOE) and were picked up by the top leadership in the USOE, the HEW Department, and the White House, said Alford of USOE's legislative office. Now, he said, ideas for new departures come from the top leadership and are passed down to the program people for fleshing out.

Like life itself, nothing is fixed in concrete in Washington except the monuments. Policy formulation and direction are usually matters of emphasis and slight shifts rather than fixed ideas and radical departures, the speakers stressed.

In an exchange with the career educators, Wirth summarized the place of educational policy-making in the 1970's. They wanted to know if he would support a particular piece of career education legislation, the Perkins' Bill, which Wirth preferred to talk about in terms of the larger picture of finding a handle to reform and control now uncontrollable spending. At some point Wirth referred to potential savings of a few million dollars as "nickels and dimes."

One participant shot back that it might be nickels and dimes to Congress, but for career educators it was a lot of money. "We're trying to get some of those nickels and dimes," the participant

declared. Wirth conceded that while there would be no big new programs, "we can jiggle at the edges; priorities can be made at the edges" of the enormous and enormously complicated Federal spending struggle.

V. THE POLICY MAZE

It is not possible in a summary of a summary to indicate more than the key complexities and some of the participants of the Washington policy scene. Timpane and Smith both listed the four major actors in policy-making--the Executive Branch, Congress, the education associations, and the courts. Speakers also emphasized the interactive nature of the maze, both across bureaucratic, membership, and power lines and within organizations.

Who Makes Policy?

Smith, who called himself a "Parliament man" said that the education associations had some influence on educational policy, the Executive Branch none, but "the primary force in policy-making is in the Congress." He argued that the Administration during the past six to eight years was killing its own influence in educational policy because its primary interest is money.

Most speakers would argue that Smith had overstated his case. However, his assertion that the Administration was interested primarily in money, and holding the line on Federal expenditures, was backed up by other speakers. Economic policy is the name of the domestic game in Washington these days. This places the Office of Management and Budget, which the monthly Washingtonian called "the Agency that Loves to Hate," in a central position to shape educational policy. Ultimately, all budget requests and all legislative proposals must be cleared and approved by the OMB, which, Martin said, is the servant of the President.

But even OMB is not in a position to say what programs will be started. Its function is one of coordination and management. With the President, it can have an influence on which programs will be terminated and which programs will have their spending reduced.

Cora Beebe, Director of the Office of Education's Planning and Budget Division, explained how educational decisions trickle through the bureaucracy. The Budget Division starts in January to formulate a five-year plan and to try to sort out the priorities for the coming year in terms of that plan, she explained. Every proposal and budget request must be cleared with the office of the HEW Secretary and ultimately with the White House and the OMB. Office of Education requests are weighed at the Secretary's office with all other education, health, and welfare proposals. After the secretary establishes his priorities, said Beebe, the White House and OMB consider how the HEW proposals fit into national economic and program priorities. Ideas

that start in U.S. Office of Education program offices tend to shrink and alter as they percolate up through the bureaucratic filter.

After everything has been cleared and fitted together, the President sends his budget and legislative proposals to Congress for action by the legislative and appropriations committees of both Houses, and for action on the floor and in conference committee. Every piece of testimony in support of the President's program goes through the same clearance process.

"There are many levels," Beebe said. "Since 1965, the addition of levels and gatekeepers had increased each year by a magnitude of two. The volume of paperwork is fantastic." By the time a proposal has worked its way through the administrative and Congressional policy process, Beebe said, it often is unrecognizable--if it survives at all.

To add to the complexity of the process there are interactions among all levels of the bureaucracy. There is constant feedback from OMB to the HEW Department and the Office of Education, and education officials get a chance to argue their case at both the departmental level and at the White House.

While not as complex as the bureaucracy, Congress is not a simple place to understand. There is the division between the legislative process, which says what the money will be spent for and tries to indicate how much will be spent, and the appropriations process, which determines how much money will actually be spent. And there are differences in style and approach between the House and Senate.

In both Houses, the staff personnel of Congressional Members and the committees play an important role in the formulation of policy, according to Smith. In the Senate, with only 100 Members, a Senator may have to stretch his time and energy among three major committees and a dozen subcommittees. This causes Senators to specialize and to rely more heavily on their staff members than is true in the House, Smith said.

He explained that there may be 12 to 15 Members of Congress who play an important role in the formulation of educational policy. For example, he said, Senator Jacob K. Javits (R-N.Y.) is the expert on adult education. Nothing happens in adult education unless Javits approves, Smith asserted. On the House side, he said Representative John Brademas (D-Ind.) provides the intellectual leadership for educational policy. "It is hard to think of a major policy decision that Brademas did not support, favor, or understand," Smith asserted.

In the Senate, he said, the staff professionals are the eyes and ears of the Senators. Because of the widespread interests of the Senators, the staff members tend to have considerable influence on the making of policy.

The House, with 435 Members, tends to limit the policy-making powers of the staff members. Representatives serve on fewer committees and can therefore focus more intently on specific issues. Cable, the Counsel for the Education and Labor Committee, said, "I firmly believe your elected Members of Congress should make educational policy. We staff members have no business making policy. My job is to make my boss's process of arriving at a conclusion easier for him." However, Cable conceded that the House committee staffs "clearly do a substantial amount of sorting, limiting options, and presenting alternatives. By presenting options, we do have an opportunity to affect policy," he said.

A third force in educational policy-making is the educational associations which have Washington offices, particularly those with government relations operations. Smith said that every job and function at the local school level has a national organization with a Washington office. Halperin estimated that there are more than 500 national associations in Washington with new ones coming all the time. In addition, 22 governors' offices, some cities, and countless individual colleges and universities maintain offices in Washington.

The educational associations have been most effective in lobbying for appropriations. They have formed a coalition among themselves which, as the Committee for the Full Funding of Education Programs, joins in common cause to obtain maximum funding for education. The committee has had mixed success, but was instrumental in persuading Congress to override Presidential vetoes of education appropriations bills. Four years ago, said Roschwalb, the committee lost an override attempt by seven votes. "We all gathered at the Congressional Hotel to weep. Representative Tom Steed of Oklahoma showed up with a big smile on his face and offered his congratulations. The disappointed lobbyists wondered why. Steed said he had been in Congress 18 years and it was the first time on the floor of the Congress that he had heard educators called sons of bitches."

The reason the Committee has been successful, Roschwalb explained, is because the members agree on how the education pie should be divided and then support the whole package in the legislative struggle. After the initial agreement, each association is responsible for mobilizing its own membership to speak on behalf of the agreement.

The courts represent the fourth dimension of the policy process. Their primary interest, Timpane asserted, is in assuring the constitu-

tionality of the law and equal protection and due process under law. "If there is an absence of procedural due process in education, the judges cannot stay out of the cases."

VI. WORKING THE SYSTEM

Many of the speakers at the Seminar offered the career educators helpful hints on how to influence educational policy at the national level. Perhaps the first and cardinal rule is to know your Congressman and his staff people. A second, offered by Senator William D. Hathaway (D-Me.), a member of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee and prominent supporter of career education in the Senate was, "Establish and maintain an ongoing working relationship with Congressional policy-makers and their staffs. . . Persistent, informative contacts, both in Washington and in your home State legislative district, can give you a champion for your ideas, if they are good ones."

Dirks and Halperin underscored the idea that the best time to see Members of Congress was when they were home. Even in an election year, Halperin said, Members of Congress spend a lot of time figuring out how to spend their time at home. He suggested that Members be invited to visit schools or projects in their own district or state. "Don't talk at people. Give them just enough information so they can see for themselves. The things they remember are the things they experience, not words," Halperin advised.

George Kaplan, Coordinator of the Career Education Policy Project, said it was difficult to corner busy people. Congressmen usually come home on weekends, and people who want to influence them should be able to accommodate the Congressional schedule. Cable warned: "Don't just focus on Brademas or (Carl) Perkins (Chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee). They're already convinced. Your own Congressman is most important."

Halperin interjected a lobbying aphorism from President Lyndon B. Johnson: "The time to make friends is before you need them." "Members of Congress, he added, "often stand around figuring out ways to get invitations to see the voters back home."

Merlin S. Olsen, Director, Career Education, Powell, Wyoming, High School, asked, "How much advance notice should we give to schedule a meeting like this?"

Cable said, "Don't schedule a meeting, give the Congressman options."

Hathaway offered another bit of advice on working the policy system: "Don't fail to be sensitive to the fact that legislators have many different issues to follow--but that their staffers are capable of spending more concentrated efforts on individual projects and ideas." He also advised building partnerships and alliances in promoting ideas.

"In the political process," Hathaway said, "the larger the group that can speak with a unified voice, the more attention will be paid to its ideas."

A third rule he offered for good lobbying was to keep proposals and requests "firmly grounded in current realities and experiences. Recognize that giant steps forward are rarely made overnight in this city, except on issues of sudden burning significance."

"Finally, you must concentrate your efforts on providing Congress the information we require to set and attain reasonable goals for the growth of sound educational ideas." He reminded the participants that they can help fill in the gaps that committee and personal staffs have not the time to gather. "Taking a bill to the floor of the Senate without adequate supporting information will make you nostalgic for the good old days of the Spanish Inquisition," Hathaway commented.

Information seems to be the currency of the public policy process. Different people seek different kinds of information. Halperin said Members of Congress love anecdotes and human interest stories about real people, preferably in their own districts. Beebe and Martin emphasized that Executive Branch officials want hard quantitative data that show that educational policies and programs are having a beneficial impact. "We don't want testimonials that the students like it, that the teachers like it, or that the parents like it," Beebe asserted.

Although the current Administration is not seen as a strong advocate of Federal support of education, Halperin warned against putting all of the lobbying eggs in one Congressional basket. "You can't afford to ignore the Executive Branch," Halperin emphasized. "The people who work in the Executive Branch are often naked and when asked to do things they don't know what to do. They don't have the information about what's working or how people feel."

He said the Executive Branch, like Congress, needs information about what is working and what is not. He conceded the difficulty of providing solid evidence that programs are working because the instruments for measuring educational effectiveness are primitive and imprecise.

On another issue, Halperin and Kaplan warned the career educators not to expect education officials to espouse causes which are contrary to Administrative policy. "When you work for the Executive Branch, you are not a free agent," Halperin said. "There is only one boss--the President." Once a policy is reached in the White House, the bureaucrat has two choices, Kaplan notes. He can either support the policy or, if he disagrees strongly enough, he can and should resign.

Halperin said, "In education it would be a horrendous mistake to divide along partisan lines. Most education bills today are supported by a majority of both parties.

Near the end of the seminar, Wirth and some of the career educators agreed that the overall assessment for education was gloomy. Halperin said, "On the issue of whether things are gloomy or not gloomy, I think it is not a gloomy picture but a changed picture. Now we are going to have to work harder for everything we have."

That message was a major message of the Seminar. Education will continue to attract support. But educators will have to work much harder than in the past just to stay even and make small gains.

VII. EVALUATION: "NOW I FEEL A PART OF AMERICAN GOVERNMENT"

At the end of the Seminar, IEL solicited an evaluation of the program by the career education participants, both as individuals and as groups. Generally, the career educators said the quality of the program, its contents, the speakers, and the format were exceedingly high.

Was the Seminar a useful learning experience? One group responded, "Yes, educators do not know enough about this kind of process." Another group said the Seminar "will produce results." Robert J. Edmondson, Director, Career Education Programs, Briston, Connecticut, Career Education Center, said the Seminar was "very useful and beneficial to me personally." And Brenda Dykes, Career Education Coordinator, Sulphur Springs, Texas, School District, declared, "I never did find government exciting until I went through this Seminar. Now, I feel a part of American government. No longer do I possess that feeling of being an outsider with no influence."

In terms of what was learned, Ben A. Yormark, Director, Career Development, Highline Public Schools, Seattle, Washington, said, "I began to understand the big picture in finance and gained an insight into the problems ahead." "I learned that bureaucratic and Congressional staff members are honest, hard-working people," said John C. Shirley, Career Education Coordinator, Region Ten Education Service Center, Richardson, Texas.

The Seminar divided into four groups to evaluate the three-plus day effort. Out of the four assessments came agreement that these were the main things the participants learned:

- .Where and how to exert pressure most effectively.
- .Insight into ways policy-makers perceive appropriations and directions in next few years.
- .Importance of relaying messages to policy-makers.
- .How the political process works and doesn't work.
- .How special interest groups work.
- .A feel for the interactive process of policy-making and its complexities.

.An understanding of the more effective ways of penetrating the system.

.The impact of the Office of Management and Budget in the policy-making process.

.Insight into the personalities and politics played out in Washington.

The participants said the Seminar would help them in their own career by making them more effective in dealing with policy formation. One group reported that the experience would "help us be able to interpret activities and actions and to apply what we have learned intelligently." Another group saw the potential for a "direct transfer of knowledge gained to the State and local level." Primo V. Toccafondi, Coordinator, Career Education, Newark, Delaware, School District, asserted, "I learned not to be afraid of the system. In general, I will be much less reluctant to become involved in the political process."

The career educators found the speakers to be candid, knowledgeable, and helpful. Bruce Perlstein called the speakers "surprisingly candid and knowledgeable." Yormark declared, "As a group, they went farther in their candor than I had expected." And Mary Louis Klaus, Director, Guidance and Career Education, Raleigh County Schools, Beckley, West Virginia, said, "I found them very forthright, professional, and human!"

Participants generally liked the panel format, feeling it gave them a chance to question and interact with the speakers. Some wanted more time for questions, but others thought that the length of the program was just right or a bit too long. The only consistent "criticism" was the absence of a representative of the Judicial Branch as a speaker. The career educators had many questions about the role of the courts in educational policy and believed that the judicial process was a critical factor in educational policy-making.

John Shirley summed up the feelings of the participants in one general comment, "The overall experience was extremely meaningful. George Kaplan and Sam Halperin and the staff did a fantastic job in facilitating the process. I appreciated the relaxed environment and your purposeful action in not dominating the Seminar."

In a nutshell, the Seminar fulfilled its purpose as conceived by the Career Education Policy Project and the Institute for Educational Leadership. It provided the participants with an intensive exposure

to policy-making in Washington, and the participants returned to their jobs and careers saying they had a deeper understanding of policy-making and how they could have an influence on it.

****

APPENDIX A

Career Education Policy Project

Project Profile

Basic Information

Title:	Career Education Policy Project
Organization:	Institute for Educational Leadership, The George Washington University
Director:	Dr. Samuel Halperin (Coordinator: George R. Kaplan), Director, Institute for Educational Leadership
Location:	Institute for Educational Leadership 1001 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Suite 310 Washington, DC 20036
Telephone:	202-833-1737/1738 (Halperin) 9051 (Kaplan)

Major Project Objectives

1. Illuminate the issues of education and work at the critical points at which public policies and major implementing decisions are made in our political and governmental institutions.

2. Examine career education in a way that will effectively inform both public and policy-level opinion of this feature of American education.

Project Activities

1. A series of carefully constructed one-hour radio programs covering the main issues of career education over our prize-winning National Public Radio series, "Options in Education."

2. Learning activities, especially seminars and field trips, designed to expand the knowledge of key national policy-makers and advisors of the content and potential of career education.

3. The extensive use of State policy-level forums catalyzed and monitored by IEL and the development of similar activities at the decision-making level in several large cities.

4. Week-long Washington seminars of key State and [illegible]y officials who need to understand the institutions, personalities, and processes of administration, legislation, and representation affecting career education in the nation's capital.

Communication

Although the products of CEPP will include actual transcripts and cassettes of radio broadcasts, as well as published records of CEPP activities, the project is not a "product-producer" in the traditional sense. The real "product" is the extent to which effective communication is established between educator and policymaker. There will be broadcasts, field trips, seminars, and state and city meetings. Schedules are not yet available.

Demographic Information

This project is intended to reach political and educational policymakers with the message of career education. Its target groups transcend economic, ethnic or other such categories. Those whom the project should affect most include:

1. The audience of the 150-165 affiliated stations of the National Public Radio that will listen to the four (or more) programs on career education issues to be broadcast during the project year.

2. The senior Congressional aides and officials of the Executive Branch of the U.S. Government who will participate in field trips and other learning activities centered on career education.

3. The elected and appointed political and educational officials of the states and cities in which CEPP Associates will be located.

4. Participants in two week-long Washington seminars for decision-makers in educational policy matters.

SCHEDULE

APPENDIX B

WASHINGTON POLICY SEMINAR FOR CAREER EDUCATORS

Tuesday, January 13 through
Friday, January 16, 1976

TUESDAY, JANUARY 13, 1976

Before 6:00 p.m.	Participants from States arrive; check in at EXECUTIVE HOUSE, 1515 Rhode Island Avenue, N.W., and receive introductory registration materials.	
6:00 p.m.	RECEPTION:	Commonwealth Parlor, Executive House
7:00 p.m.	DINNER MEETING:	"How Educational Policy Decisions Are Made in Washington - Institutions, Processes, Personalities and Problems"
	Place:	North Panel Room, Executive House
	Speaker: Michael Timpane	Senior Researcher, The Rand Corporation (former Deputy Assistant Secretary for Educational Planning, HEW)

* * * * * * * * * *

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 14, 1976

Day at the Institute for Educational Leadership (IEL)

8:30 a.m. to 10:30 a.m.	PANEL DISCUSSION:	"The Current Educational Policy-making Scene"
	Place:	IEL Conference Room, Suite 310, 1001 Connecticut Ave., N.W. (enter on northeast corner of K Street, not Connecticut--between Drug Fair & Alitalia)
	Panelists:	
	Patsy Fleming	Research Assistant, Committee on Rules, U.S. House of Representatives
	Judith Miller	Washington Correspondent, Progressive Magazine
	Richard Smith	Attorney (formerly Associate Counsel, Senate Education Subcommittee)
10:45 a.m. to 12:15 p.m.	PANEL DISCUSSION:	"The Role of HEW and the White House in Educational Policy"
	Place:	IEL Conference Room

	Panelists:	
	Bernard Martin	Chief, Economics-Science-General Government Branch, OMB
	Richard Hastings	Deputy Assistant Secretary for Legislation (Education) HEW
	Phillip Austin	Deputy Assistant Secretary for Policy Development, HEW
12:15 p.m. to 2:15 p.m,	LUNCHEON DISCUSSION:	"Recap: Map of Political Washington" with Samuel Halperin and George Kaplan
	PLACE:	IEL Conference Room
2:30 p.m. to 4:30 p.m.	PANEL DISCUSSION:	"The Policy Role of the Office of Career Education, USOE"
	Place:	IEL Conference Room
	Panelists:	
	Kenneth Hoyt	Director, Office of Career Education, USOE
	John Lindia	Deputy Director, OCE, USOE
	Sidney High	Director, Career Education Programs, OCE

* * * * * * * * FREE NIGHT * * * * * * * * * *

THURSDAY, JANUARY 15, 1975

Morning at IEL; afternoon on Capitol Hill

8:30 a.m. to 10:30 a.m.	PANEL DISCUSSION:	"How USOE Makes and Implements Federal Educational Policy"
	Place:	IEL Conference Room
	Panelists:	
	Cora Beebe	Director, Budget Division, USOE
	Albert Alford	Assistant Commissioner for Legislation, USOE
10:45 a.m. to 12:00	PANEL DISCUSSION:	"Educational Policy-Making as Viewed by the Education and Work Task Force, National Institute of Education"
	Place:	IEL Conference Room
	Panelists:	
	Lois-ellin Datta	Assistant Director, Education and Work Group, National Institute of Education

	David Hampson	Chief, Career Exploration Division, Education and Work Group, NIE
	Ella Kelly	Acting Chief, Career Access Branch, Education and Work Group, NIE
12:45 p.m. to 2:15	LUNCHEON MEETING:	"The Congressional Appropriations Process"
	Place:	Room 2257 Rayburn Building Independence Ave. and South Capitol Street
	Speaker:	
	Harley Dirks	Professional Staff Member, Subcommittee on Labor, Health, Education and Welfare, Senate Appropriations Committee
2:30 p.m. to 3:45	PANEL DISCUSSION:	"Working with Capitol Hill: The Role of Congressional Staff and the Legislative Committees in Policy Formulation"
	Place:	Room 2257 Rayburn Building
	Panelists:	
	William Cable	Counsel, House Committee on Education and Labor
	Jack Duncan	Counsel, Subcommittee on Select Education, House Committee on Education and Labor
4:00 p.m. to 5:30	PANEL DISCUSSION:	"Educational Lobbying on the Hill"
	Place:	Room 2257 Rayburn Building
	Panelists:	
	Members of the Committee for Full Funding of Education Programs Steering Committee	
	Jerold Roschwalb	Director, Governmental Relations for Higher Education, National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges
	Gregory Humphrey	Co-director, Department of Legislation, American Federation of Teachers
	Michael Resnick	Director of Legislative Services, National School Board Association
6:30 p.m.	RECEPTION:	Chandelier Room, Sheraton-Carlton Hotel, 16th & K Streets, N.W.
7:00	DINNER MEETING:	"The U.S. Senate and the Current State of Education Policy-making"
	Place:	Chandelier Room, Sheraton-Carlton Hotel
	Speaker:	
	Honorable William D. Hathaway	U.S. Senator (D-Maine)

FRIDAY, JANUARY 16

Morning on Capitol Hill; afternoon at IEL

8:15 a.m. to 10:00	BREAKFAST MEETING:	"A Congressman Views the Federal Education Role"
	Place:	B-369 (Buffet Room) Rayburn Building Independence Avenue and South Capitol St.
	Speaker:	
	Honorable Timothy Wirth	U.S. House of Representatives (D-Colorado)
10:00 a.m. to 12:00	FREE TIME	(to visit your representatives on Capitol Hill)
12:00 to 2:30	LUNCHEON MEETING:	"The Political World of Education Associations, Their Roles, Their Constituencies, and Their Relationship to Policy"
	Place:	IEL Conference Room
	Panelists:	
	Patrick J. McDonough	Executive Director for Professional and Governmental Affairs, American Personnel and Guidance Association
	Dean Griffin	Associate Director, American Vocational Association
	Stanley McFarland	Director of Government Relations, National Education Association
2:30 p.m. to 4:30	PARTICIPANT OVERVIEW AND EVALUATION OF SEMINAR	

* * * * * * * * *

PARTICIPANTS

APPENDIX C

WASHINGTON POLICY SEMINAR FOR CAREER EDUCATORS

January 13 - January 16, 1976

Robert Adkinson
Superintendent
Ceres Unified School District
P.O. Box 307
Ceres, California 95307

Roy Bagley
Director, Career Education
Maine School Administrative District
Cumberland Center, Maine 04021

Anita Barber
Career Education Coordinator
State Department of Education
State Office Building, Room 815
Montgomery, Alabama 36130

Vincent Barry
Director
National Cooperative for Career Education
University of Montana
Missoula, Montana 59801

Lee Bowen
Supervisor of Career Education
Pringe George's Public Schools
Upper Marlboro, Maryland 20870

Donald A. Casella
Director
Office of Career Development
University of Alabama
P.O. Box 1423
University, Alabama 35486

Barbara S. Churchill
Guidance Specialist/Career Resources
Attleboro High School
Attleboro, Massachusetts 02703

Brenda Dykes
Career Education Coordinator
Sulphur Springs School District
P.O. Box 276
Sulphur Springs, Texas 75482

Saul Dulberg
Coordinator, Career Education
State Department of Education
State Office Building 7219
Hartford, Connecticut 06115

Robert J. Edmondson
Director, Career Education Programs
Bristol Career Education Center
237 Wolcott Street
Bristol, Connecticut 06013

Ann Gregory
Director
Elementary Community Education
Flint Public Schools
932 E. Kearsley Street
Flint, Michigan 48502

Ross Henderson
Director, Career Education
State Department of Education
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601

Mary Louise Klaus
Director
Guidance and Career Education
Raleigh County Schools
105 Adair Street
Beckley, West Virginia 25801

Darryl Laramore
Supervisor, Vocational Guidance
Montgomery County Public Schools
850 Hungerford Drive
Rockville, Maryland 20850

Otto Mattei
Director, Career Education Project
Bowling Green High School
1801 Rockingham Lane
Louisville, Kentucky 40218

George F. Meyer
Director, Career Education
New Brunswick Public Schools
24 Bayard Street
New Brunswick, New Jersey 08901

Bennat C. Mullen
Associate Professor
Stephen F. Austin State University
Box 3018 SFAU
Nocogdoches, Texas 75961

Rita Nugent
Work Experience Coordinator
Sunny Hills High School
Fullerton, California 92635

Merlin S. Olson
Director, Career Education
Powell High School
Powell, Wyoming 82435

Kim A. Powers
Coordinator
Career Exploration and Guidance
Department of Public Instruction
120 W. Market, 16th Floor
Indianapolis, Indiana 46240

Pam Serio
Career Education Coordinator
Alleghany BOCES
Six South Street
Belmont, New York 14813

John C. Shirley
Career Education Coordinator
Region 10 Education Center
P.O. Box 1300
Richardson, Texas 75080

Primo V. Toccafondi
Coordinator, Career Education
Newark School District
P.O. Box 360
Newark, Delaware 19711

William E. Weisberger
Director, Office of Career Education
Michigan Department of Education
P.O. Box 420
Lansing, Michigan 48902

Ben A. Yormark
Director, Career Development
Highline Public Schools
15675 Ambaum Boulevard S.W.
Seattle, Washington 98166

Michael A. Zockle
Director, Career Education Project
Warren City Schools
Warren, Ohio 44483

Education Policy Fellows

Bruce Perlstein
Massachusetts State Department of Education
Boston, Massachusetts

Don Phillips
Dissemination and Resources Group
National Institute of Education
Washington, D.C. 20208

Melvin Williams
Division of Education for the Disadvantaged
U.S. Office of Education
Washington, D.C. 20202

Institute for Educational Leadership

Samuel Halperin, Director
Diane Brundage, Education Policy Fellow

Career Education Policy Project

George Kaplan, Coordinator
Sharon Grant, Program Assistant

EDUCATION POLICY FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM (EPFP) (formerly Washington Internships in Education) is a national program designed to help provide future leaders the skills in policy-making they must have to exert effective and enlightened leadership in American education. Funds for the program are provided by the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations.

Since 1965, the program has placed over 250 mid-career persons in one-year internships in public and private agencies involved in educational policy matters. Carefully recruited sponsors, who are themselves key actors in public policy issues, agree to serve as on-the-job mentors by demonstrating, through their daily tasks, how educational policy is shaped at the State or national level. An important ingredient of the program is the informal weekly seminars through which Fellows interact with decision-makers, eminent authorities and leading specialists in education-related fields. National meetings of Fellows with other special groups contribute further to their understanding of educational policy-making. Fellows' salaries are paid by the sponsoring organizations, while the costs of recruitment, placement and continuing professional development are borne by the EPF Program. Headquartered in Washington with sites in four States, the EPF Program is designed for mid-career persons 25-45 years of age who have completed their academic training. Two-thirds of the forty-five participants in 1975-76 have completed the doctorate degree; all have demonstrated substantial leadership skills and a strong commitment to improving the educational system.

Although EPFP participants are widely considered to be prime candidates for excellent post-Fellowship positions, the EPF Program does not commit itself to obtaining future employment for them. Fellows frequently take leaves of absence from their pre-Fellowship position to participate in the program.

Illinois Coordinator—Robert Bunnell
Massachusetts Coordinator—Ursula Wagener
Michigan Coordinators—Carl Candoli & Matthew Prophet

EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR (ESS) is a professional development program designed for staff members employed by the Executive and Legislative branches of the Federal Government in the field of education. The goals of ESS are to provide an open forum in which participants can improve their professional capabilities and personal fulfillment on the job by:

a) being exposed to new ideas and perspectives;
b) increasing their knowledge of particular subjects and their understanding of how things actually operate in the field; and
c) meeting with other professionals involved in the legislative and policy formulation processes in an informal learning environment which fosters improved professional relationships.

ESS supplements the Washington work experience with a variety of in-service training seminars and in-the-field observation. It was established in 1969 and is funded by the Institute and by partial reimbursement from the governmental agencies served.

In fiscal year 1975, ESS conducted 73 programs for over 2200 Federal employees. Included were 16 field trips and 57 luncheon/dinner discussion meetings, site visits, demonstrations, and other executive development activities.

THE ASSOCIATES PROGRAM (TAP) is an evolving IEL activity whose emphasis up to now has been the provision of seminars and other forums for legislators and other policy-makers at State capitals. Begun in 1972 with three State educational seminars, TAP now sponsors 21 seminars, all manned by Associates who, on a part-time basis, arrange 5-10 programs annually.

Other TAP efforts—

Maintain a network of State-level "generalists" (Associates) whose ties to IEL in the nation's capital provide rare linkages among Federal and State education policy-setters.

Encourage similar linkages among agencies and coalitions seeking to improve processes of State-level decision-making.

Support attempts of individual State leaders (governors, chief state school officers, legislative committees, etc.) to improve policy-making machinery and to narrow the communications gap which separates political and professional leaders.

OTHER IEL ACTIVITIES

Under a grant from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare's Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, IEL has established an issue development service for consideration and transmission of key policy issues in postsecondary education. The **POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION CONVENING AUTHORITY (PECA)** sponsors conferences, research efforts, task force groups and publications focusing on such issues as institutional licensing, consumer protection, and State financing. During 1975-76 the program will add lifelong learning and public policy to its agenda.

IEL and National Public Radio co-produce the **"OPTIONS IN EDUCATION"** series, heard weekly over NPR's 179 member stations from coast to coast. Voice of America rebroadcasts the 1-hour programs, and IEL makes cassettes and transcripts available at minimum cost. In 1974 "Options" received awards from the Education Writers Association and the Council for the Advancement and Support of Education, Mason-Dixon Division. Funds for "Options in Education" provided by IEL, National Institute of Education, U.S. Office of Education, Robert S. Clark Foundation, NPR, and other grantors.

Under contract from the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Education, HEW, IEL is planning major conference activity early in 1976 for educational decision-makers and administrators on the subject of institutional adjustment to changing sex roles. The goals of the **NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON WOMEN IN EDUCATION,** which include increasing training and career options for women in education and facilitating Title IX implementation, will be pursued in cooperation with women's group leaders, policy-makers and the educational community generally.

The **CAREER EDUCATION POLICY PROJECT (CEPP)** addresses the issues of education, work and society. Funded by the U.S. Office of Education, CEPP uses the resources of other IEL programs—ESS, TAP, "Option"—to inform both policy-makers and the public of the issues in the career education movement.